



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,497	08/30/2001	Gurtej Singh Sandhu	303.541US3	4564

7590 09/05/2002
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402

EXAMINER

ROSE, KIESHA L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2822

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/945,497

Applicant(s)

SANDHU ET AL.

Examiner

Kiesha L. Rose

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 53-108 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 61-68 and 77-84 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 53-60, 69-76 and 85-108 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the election filed 17 June 2002.

Election/Restrictions

Claims 61-68 and 77-84 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected method of making a semiconductor device, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 5.

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-9, 53-60, 69-76 and 85-108 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description:

Fig. 4, # 70

Fig. 10, #80

A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1-6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent 6,025,246).

Kim discloses a capacitor structure (Fig. 1F) that contains a conductive polysilicon cylindrical container (5a) having a closed bottom and sidewalls extending upward from the closed bottom and an oxide dielectric cap (6a) on top of the sidewalls.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7, as applied to claim 1, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim.

Kim discloses the claimed invention except for the dielectric cap being annealed.

In regards to the dielectric being annealed, a "*product by process*" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, *In re Hirao and Sato et al.*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (CCPA 1976) (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown and Saffer*, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); *In re Luck and Gainer*, 177 USPQ 523 (CCPA 1973); *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974); and *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289 (CAFC 1983) final product per se which must be determined in a "*product by, all of*" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product, whether claimed in "*product by process*" claims or not. Note that Applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above caselaw makes clear. Even though product -by[-] process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based upon the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product is made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)(citations omitted)."

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Yoo et al. (U.S. Patent 6,177,340).

Kim discloses a capacitor structure (Fig. 1F) that contains a conductive cylindrical container (5a) having a closed bottom and sidewalls extending upward from the closed bottom and an oxide dielectric cap (6a) on top of the sidewalls, where the dielectric layer can also be silicon oxynitride. Kim discloses all of the limitations except for the

Art Unit: 2822

container structure to comprise hemispherical grain polysilicon. Whereas Yoo discloses a capacitor (Fig. 16) that contains a cylindrical capacitor structure (42) comprising conductively doped hemispherical grain polysilicon (44). The container structure is formed with hemispherical grain polysilicon to increase surface area, and increase capacitance and performance. (Column 8, lines 29-33) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the capacitor of Kim by incorporating the capacitor structure to comprise hemispherical grain polysilicon to increase surface area, capacitance and performance as taught by Yoo. In regards to claim 9 where the dielectric cap is annealed at 600°C to 1000°C, a "*product by process*" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, *In re Hirao and Sato et al.*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (CCPA 1976) (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown and Saffer*, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); *In re Luck and Gainer*, 177 USPQ 523 (CCPA 1973); *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974); and *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289 (CAFC 1983) final product per se which must be determined in a "*product by, all of*" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product, whether claimed in "*product by process*" claims or not. Note that Applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above caselaw makes clear. Even though product -by[-] process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based upon the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the

Art Unit: 2822

claim is unpatentable even though the prior product is made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)(citations omitted)."

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 53-60,69-76 and 85-108 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kiesha L. Rose whose telephone number is 703-605-4212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00 off 1st Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on 703-308-4940. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

KR

KLR

August 28, 2002


CARL WHITEHEAD, J.R.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800